

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 19-20 are pending. Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action dated August 3, 2007 ("Office Action") in this Application. Applicants present the above amendments and following remarks in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Applicants have amended Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 19-20 in this Response. Applicants have cancelled Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11, 14, 17-18, and 21-22 in this Response. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview conducted October 29, 2007. During the interview the above amendments and following remarks were discussed.

Claims 7-8 and 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, regarding Claim 9, the Examiner asserts that "the kernel" lacks proper antecedent basis. Office Action, Page 2. Applicants have cancelled Claims 7-8 in this Response. Applicants have amended Claim 9 to recite, in relevant part, "the system kernel." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 9 (and its dependent Claims) under Section 112, second paragraph, has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-10, 12-15, and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,289,369 by Sundaresan et al. ("Sundaresan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,159,221 by Willen et al. ("Willen"). Claims 2, 8, 11, 16, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sundaresan in view of Willen and further in view

of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0102671 by Baumberger (“Baumberger”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

More particularly, the Examiner admits that “Sundaresan and Willen do not explicitly teach the one of the plurality of library processors has exactly two task buffers.” Office Action, Page 7. To supply this missing element, the Examiner offers Baumberger, asserting that “Baumberger teaches . . . the one of the plurality of library processors has exactly two task buffers (paragraph 16, lines 1-6).” Office Action, Page 7. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assessment.

First, Applicants respectfully note that Baumberger, in particular the cited passage, teaches virtual machines, not task buffers. *See* Baumberger, Paragraphs [0015]-[0016]. Applicants respectfully submit that Baumberger’s virtual machines do not show the task buffers as recited in the claims. Specifically, as described in Baumberger, virtual machines are significantly more complex than the recited task buffers, defeating the purpose of providing a simple latency solution: “These virtual machines may contain standard operating systems, such as, e.g., Microsoft Windows® or Linux, or a much smaller operating system.” Baumberger, Paragraph [0004]. Further, nowhere does Baumberger even hint that Baumberger’s virtual machines are suitable for use as task buffers as recited in the Claims.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that because Baumberger fails to teach the very element the Examiner admits is missing from Claims 2, 8, 11, 16, and 22, these Claims would be allowable over the cited art individually or in any combination. However, Applicants have in this Response cancelled Claims 2, 11, and 16, and moved the element limiting each library processor to exactly two task buffers into their respective independent Claims 1, 9, and 15.

Specifically, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite, in relevant part, “wherein each library processor comprises exactly two task buffers.” Applicants have amended Claim 9 to recite,

in relevant part, “wherein each of the plurality of library processors comprises exactly two task buffers.” Applicants have amended Claim 15 to recite, in relevant part, “wherein each library processor comprises exactly two task buffers.” Support for these amendments can be found, among other places, in the original claims and at Page 4, lines 1-2; Page 4, lines 22-23; and Page 6, lines 7-17 of the Original Application.

Furthermore, Applicants have also amended Claims 1, 9, and 15 to further distinguish the novel combination recited in the Claims. Specifically, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 15 to recite, in relevant part, “dividing a task into a plurality of subtasks” and “wherein distributing a subtask from the plurality of tasks in the centralized task queue to the one of the plurality of library processors comprises the one of the plurality of library processors fetching the subtask from the centralized task queue.” Applicants have also amended Claim 9 to recite, in relevant part, “a system kernel configured to receive a task and to divide the received task into a plurality of subtasks” and “wherein each of the plurality of library processors is configured to fetch at least one subtask of the plurality of subtasks from the library task queue.” Support for these amendments can be found, among other places, in the original claims and at Page 4, lines 1-2; Page 4, lines 22-23; and Page 6, lines 7-17 of the Original Application. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest these unique elements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 9, and 15 are therefore clearly and precisely patentable over Sundaresan, Willen, and Baumberger, and the remaining references of record, individually or in any combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of independent Claims 1, 9, and 15 be withdrawn and that independent Claims 1, 9, and 15 be allowed.

Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11, 14, 17-18, and 21-22 have been cancelled in this response. Claims 2 and 5-6 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Claims 10 and 12-13 depend on and further limit Claim 9. Claims 16 and 19-20 depend on and further limit Claim 15. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent Claims are also patentable over the cited references, individually or in any combination, for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims are patentable over the cited references, as described above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that dependent Claims 2, 5-6, 10, 12-13, 16, and 19-20 also be allowed.

Applicants have now addressed all of the Claim objections and rejections cited in the Office Action. In view of the amendments to the Claims and Applicants' remarks, Applicants believe that pending Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 19-20 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 19-20.

Applicants believe no additional fees are due in this Response. In the event that any other fees are due, Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 of IBM Corporation.

Applicants believe that the present Response contains a complete response to the issues raised in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request full reconsideration. If the Examiner should have any questions, comments or suggestions, the undersigned attorney earnestly requests a telephone conference. In particular, should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: November 2, 2007
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093